



Regional Research Institute Publications and
Working Papers

Regional Research Institute

1998

Expressions of Discontent in America: Regional and Temporal Aspects of Third Party Governors and Gubernatorial Candidates, 1866-1996

Shannon Jones

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/rri_pubs



Part of the [Regional Economics Commons](#)

Digital Commons Citation

Jones, Shannon, "Expressions of Discontent in America: Regional and Temporal Aspects of Third Party Governors and Gubernatorial Candidates, 1866-1996" (1998). *Regional Research Institute Publications and Working Papers*. 167.
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/rri_pubs/167

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Regional Research Institute at The Research Repository @ WVU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Regional Research Institute Publications and Working Papers by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact ian.harmon@mail.wvu.edu.

Expressions of Discontent in America:
Regional and Temporal Aspects of Third Party Governors
and Gubernatorial Candidates, 1866-1996

by

Shannon Jones

RESEARCH PAPER 9807

Regional Research Institute
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6825
Morgantown, WV 26506-6825

1997-98 National Science Foundation Undergraduate Research Fellow

Mentor: Kenneth C. Martis, Professor of Geography

May, 1998

Abstract: Democrats and Republicans traditionally dominate elections in America. The main goal of this project lies in determining if support for third parties exists and if certain third party support patterns exist within the United States. This project examines gubernatorial elections beginning with 1866 and continuing through 1996. This research does demonstrate that third party support has definite patterns and characteristics. Certain third parties rise up and exist for definite periods of time. Eventually they lose their support or their cause loses its salience. However, it remains one huge cycle: prevalent parties appear, and then disappear, making way for other parties to emerge. The Midwest, the Far West states, and select New England states have all consistently supported third party candidates. Obviously, the Midwest states existed mainly as agrarian communities and areas of prevalent immigrant settlements. Therefore, during the times of hardship it is obvious they would support third parties concerned with issues they felt. Following this agrarian tradition, certain states (Minnesota and Wisconsin) still today support third parties more often than other states. The gubernatorial elections in these areas reflect the values, traditions, economics and social nature of the citizens. Third parties play an important role in the two party system which most Americans accept without question. The entrance of a third party onto the political scene in America gives rise to those important questions. Third parties offer a forum for discussion of new and different ideas. They often allow disadvantaged groups to have a choice in the politics of their chosen party. In essence, third parties allow for expressions of discontent.

Expressions of Discontent in America:
Regional and Temporal Aspects of Third Party Governors and
Gubernatorial Candidates 1866-1996

I. Introduction

Third parties present researchers with several interesting questions. Where do third parties originate? Why are they formed? And, most important, how do their candidates get elected? History proves that third parties occasionally do achieve success at the polls, even though the two party system dominates American politics. For years academics studied the advent and institution of the third party. How these parties achieve success continues to intrigue researchers.

Democrats and Republicans traditionally dominate elections in America. However, third parties which gain office explains much about our political system and the culture of a particular state or region. This project examines gubernatorial elections beginning with 1856 and continuing through 1996. The main goal of this project lies in determining if certain third party support patterns exist within the United States. Are there certain time periods of third party support throughout history? Do certain states and regions tend to support third parties more than other areas? These questions and many others are addressed in the following pages.

II. Governors

Functions

“During the last thirty years the American governor has
emerged as a policy leader of no mean proportions.”

--Coleman B. Ransone, Jr. (The American Governorship 3)

The responsibility for the resurgence of state government's power and importance lies not

with the states, but with the federal government. Presidents such as Nixon, Carter, Reagan and now Clinton, devolved, deregulated and defunded many federal programs; thus placing the burden of the programs' execution on the states (Rosenthal 1). Governors and states assumed the responsibility of maintaining, funding, administering and regulating the programs which were still highly demanded, and even federally mandated. States produce more policies, more regulations, and more laws than ever before (Rosenthal 1). This steady rise in state power requires a strong, forceful, experienced and single executive: the governor.

Policy Formation

Changes in fiscal federalism and the so-called "New Federalism" left the states to shoulder the burden of many former federal programs (Rosenthal 1). Each of these programs have specific policy venues with which they work. These programs need guidance from a single executive who reflects the state's specific areas of policy concern. Who better than the governor to organize and coordinate state policies among different agencies? Who better than the governor to know the public, their concerns and to have easy access to their opinions? Enter the governor onto the political policy formation stage.

Party Chief

Governors influence three major areas of policy within their states: their own political party's policies, the legislative policies, and the state departmental policies (Ransone The Office of Governor 157). As the chief state executive, governors have numerous opportunities to meet with state political party leaders to discuss policy. Also, as the top elected official, leaders of the governor's party look to them for leadership and guidance in many policy formation areas.

Another major stronghold the governor possesses with their appointment abilities (Ransone The American Governorship 120). Governors have to fill a tremendous amount of appointed positions

in state, and even local, governments. Most likely they fill these positions with people loyal to their party and someone who upholds the party's ideals (Ransone The American Governorship 120). Those loyal to the party usually formulate policies which coincide with the governor's agenda and remain dedicated to these policies.

Legislative Leader

The party chief role offers the governor a chance partially to control the policies formed within the state, and to assure their policy agenda receives attention. All governors take office with a certain policy platform in mind (Ransone The American Governorship 130). Many items on these platforms take legislative form. According to Rosenthal, "Governors initiate legislation, which legislators introduce on their behalf" (5). They help shape the legislation throughout the process, working with legislators to ensure the original intent is kept. Finally, they review the legislation after it passes the legislature and before it becomes law (5).

Most state constitutions reserve the right for the governor to "recommend [to the Legislature] such measures as he may deem desirable" (Article V, Section I of the New Jersey Constitution; Rosenthal 6). Governors take opportunities throughout their administrations to propose and suggest legislation to legislators. From the time they take office with their inaugural address to the State of the State address, governors make their agendas clear to state lawmakers.

The success of the legislation they suggest lies with their powers of patronage, experience, publicity, popularity and persuasion (Rosenthal 5). Each of these strengthen with time. Governors have various opportunities to provide for people who are loyal to them. Numerous appointments, party positions, large favors and even small favors such as dealing with a constituent complaint plays a large role in a governor's ability to influence (Rosenthal 13). With time also comes experience. Time allows the governor to become familiar with the constituents

(the legislature and the people), gain confidence and build respect. With familiarity, confidence, and respect comes an increased ability to influence (Rosenthal 21).

Governors, as a single unit, are more likely to gain media time than the legislature. Through publicity they can influence the public and in turn the public can influence the legislature on certain issues of concern (Rosenthal 25). Another key factor in a governor's influence is their popularity. A popular governor culminates respect and prestige in the public and the legislature. Prestige and respect are key components to the governor's ability to push their agenda through the system (Rosenthal 28). Stemming from the previous areas, governors procure a sense of persuasion with the public and the legislature (Rosenthal 35). Without persuasion, the governor's agenda may take a back seat on the legislative calendar and eventually die.

All these powers culminate with the final power of the veto. Governors, with the exception of North Carolina, have the luxury of reviewing every bill passing the legislative bodies (or body) in their state (Rosenthal 9). If vetoed, the bill does not take effect unless overturned by a super majority in the legislature. Some states grant the governor the power of "executive amendment," enabling the executive to revise the bill and send it back to the legislature for vote (Rosenthal 9). This great final power of rejection or approval becomes the governors ultimate control over legislation. All these powers combined make the governor the definite legislative leader in the state.

Public Relations

Governor Jerry Apodaca of New Mexico (1975-79) believes that governors actually have two constituencies: the legislature and the public (Ransone The American Governorship 107). He feels that relations with the legislature become prevalent when serving the second constituency. In order to serve the public, and keep campaign promises, governors must work closely with and

prompt the legislature to pass their agenda. The relationship with the public for a governor remains an important one from the day they begin campaigning to the day they leave office.

Governors must keep the lines of communication open between themselves and the public. As chief spokesperson for the state, the governor must ensure they reflect the public sentiment (Ransone The American Governorship 20). A main consideration for governors rests with the responses they give the public and daily contact they have with the public. Public relations consumes much of the governor's and his staff's time. Public appearances, responses to inquiries, and contact with the media rank high on the governor's priority list. An unidentified governor claims: "No area is more sensitive to the maintenance of good public relations for a governor, and conversely to creating unneeded ill will, than the responses made to written and telephonic communications addresses to the chief executive's office" (1976 Survey from the Center for Policy Research of the National Governors' Association; Rosenthal The American Governorship 109). In essence, communication and public relations either make or break the top state executive.

Management

A governor's responsibility for his agenda does not cease with selling the package to the public, or even with its passage in the legislature. In the early stages, the governor takes a more prevalent role in the policy process, working with legislators and even special interest groups to form salient policies for the state. However, the process never ends. As the bill becomes law and moves to a specific agency to be implemented and enforced, the governor guides the administrative agency on the original intent of the legislation, aiding them in the realization of the policy (Ransone Office of the Governor 216).

Not only does the governor appoint many positions within each state department, they

guide policies, control the purse-strings, solve disputes within agencies, and offer interagency coordination and mediation (Ransone Office of the Governor 217). As with the legislature, the governor offers “suggestions” to the administrative agencies on how to execute programs and legislation finding their way to their agencies. Governors also have a strong voice in the budget processes of the state. Most governors set forth a proposed budget to the legislature for passage (Ransone The American Governorship 126). By controlling the amount of money an agency receives, the governor controls much of their activities. Common sense tells us that the less restrictions on money, the more powerful an agency can potentially become. Another important aspect of the governor’s office comes with intergovernmental agency relations. As the common thread among the agencies, the governor’s office offers assistance, mediation and coordination among the various agencies (Ransone Office of the Governor 264).

Elections

Even though the gubernatorial selection process varies slightly from state to state, the basic principle remains the same. After parties nominate their candidate, a popular election occurs. The candidate with a plurality of the popular vote gains office (Ransone Office of the Governor 4). However, in Georgia, Maine, Mississippi and Vermont the candidate must receive a majority of the popular vote. If no candidate receives a majority, the legislature chooses the governor (Ransone Office of the Governor 4).

III. Third Parties

Why do they exist in our two party system?

“Third parties create space for political expression.”

--Gerald Fresia (24)

Since America's colonial days and the Revolutionary War, we have possessed a healthy desire for expressive and political freedom. Many colonists left England and began a life here searching for those basic freedoms. Needless to say, those feelings remain hard to suppress even today. Patriotism, pride and rebellion course through America's veins. Political activity in the United States reflects these values; parties, which mirror political sentiment and current issues, emerge and disappear.

During the late 1850s one party survived and one arose to become the leaders in American politics for the next 140 years: the Democrats and the Republicans. Several other parties, however, achieved successes at the polls over the years and some remain as minor contenders today. Why these parties achieve success fascinates many scholars. Many varying theories exist as to the success rate and proliferation of third parties in some areas of the country. Gillespie (Politics at the Periphery), Hesseltine (Rise and Fall of Third Parties and Third-Party Movements in the United States), Fresia (There Comes a Time), Burnham (Critical Elections), Wattenberg (The Decline of American Political Parties) and many others all have differing viewpoints on third party existence. Despite the contrasts, several common points exist within each author's explanations.

Major Party Disenchantment

Declines in overall party identification in the United States denotes one such indicator of third party success. Wattenberg graphs his findings to show that party identification has steadily declined through the years (24). He says people now have the “may the best person win” attitude (39). Walter Burnham explains “a rise in a mass base for independent political movements” seems to be one possible consequence of this decline (Wattenberg 24). Therefore, as citizens become more and more disenchanted with the major parties, they tend to either identify with third parties, become nonpartisan or completely drop out of political life. Whites, the young and people of high class status exhibit a greater propensity toward political independence (Kamieniecki 73).

Issue Unresponsiveness

Disenchantment also comes at the price of issue unresponsiveness by the major parties. Fresia refers to third parties as creating space for important political expression (24). America formed as a representative democracy, which reinforces the need for third parties (Black 30). To truly represent the citizens of such a heterogeneous state, varying parties exist and encompass the various ideals of the nation. Even more, third parties serve as outlets for the disadvantaged and subordinate groups in the United States. The “divorce of the interest of party elites from the real interest of disadvantage people” facilitates the formation of parties to compete with the Democrats and the Republicans (Fresia 10). Third parties function to allow citizens to “blow off steam” and show their dissent from the major parties (Gillespie 21).

For one-hundred forty years, Democrats and Republicans have dominated the political field. Sometimes it is necessary for them to face challengers. Our current two party system does not allow for self examination (Fresia 38). Hence, the entrance of a third party makes the established parties refocus their campaigns on the issues relevant to the people. Third parties call attention to serious problems (Hesseltine Rise and Fall 9). Often times these parties not only address the problem, but suggest the proper solution. Fresia argues the healthy nature of the third party keeps the major parties in check. The two major parties necessarily exist as umbrella organizations and economic forums which correspond to specific economic interests, and the wide range of politics they promote, the range of voices they hear, and the way in which they respond to the issues are already safely within the “spun web of shared norms and standards” of the party (Fresia 93).

Economic Performance

The nation’s economic performance has been tied closely to votes since the beginning of our current system. “A poor economy is sure to promote voter disaffection with at least one of the major parties” (Rosenstone 134). Rosenstone argues that obviously the incumbent party will lose votes resulting from an economic downturn, but it may also incline voters to abandon the other major party. This leaves room for third parties to exist and suggest alternatives to the economic hardships (Rosenstone 134).

Several times throughout our history, economic adversity has led farmers and urban workers to third parties. Following the Civil War, Southern farmers relying on crop liens to survive became unable to meet their debts when crop prices fell drastically (Rosenstone 134-5). According to a chart by Rosentone, between 1865 and 1896 cotton prices fell from 15 cents to six cents a pound (135). Wheat and corn prices also dropped significantly. Overall, agricultural

prices diminished by 73 percent during the three decades after the Civil War (134). As a result of dropping prices, farmers had to rely on business to market their goods effectively. Farmers had to ship their goods by rail, using the highly monopolistic freight companies which charged outrageous shipping prices (Rosenstone 135).

Hardship breeds revolution, therefore, third parties catering to the agrarian society began to emerge. The Greenbacks and the Populists both sprung up as a reaction to the economic adversity occurring in the country. Forming in Iowa in 1876, the Greenback Party achieved successes in congressional elections, and its popularity went up and down with farm prices (Rosenstone 135). By 1888, its main power surge extinguished, and the Populist Party rose to take up the concerns of farmers. Likewise, the farm economy reflected party support for the Populists. They achieved several successes, gained many voters, yet fell off of the political stage by 1902 (Rosenstone 136-7).

Unacceptable Candidates

Today, American voters rely more on the apparent quality of the candidate, rather than the parties for certain ideals and ideas. Voters need to trust and respect the candidates of our present elections (Rosenstone 138). When perceptions of the Democratic or Republican candidates are less than desirable, third party candidates may appear as attractive alternatives. Therefore, as Rosenstone observes, “the greater the legitimacy of the third party candidate, the higher is the probability that voters will cast their lot with [them]” (139).

Most voters seek experience when choosing a candidate. Name recognition, previous public office and campaign skills all play serious roles in determining the attractiveness of a candidate. In essence, the higher the quality of the candidate, the more likely citizens are to break away from traditional parties (Rosenstone 140).

Specific Issues of Concern

Third parties have emerged for varying reasons and seem to possess several common bonds. One of those being that most often third parties championed a highly salient and very specific issue. The Prohibition Party championed the cause of prohibiting the sale of alcohol in the United States. Farmers Alliance groups arose out of agricultural turmoil in the Midwest (Hesseltine Third Party 64). Hesseltine explains “that the political expression of agrarian traditions runs through a long line of agitators, namely the Homestead Act, Anti-rent voters, Anti-masonic protestors, Jeffersonian frontiersman and Whig rebels” (64).

One issue parties rally around their cause, and gain strength from this issue. The Green Party formed from people concerned with environmental issues (Gillespie 286). Others, such as the Creators Rights Party want to ensure Christian values remain present in the government (<http://www.christiangallery.com/creator.html>). Even those with concerns about taxes have their own party--the US Taxpayers Party (<http://www.ustaxpayers.org>).

Constraints on Third Parties

Even though third parties have achieved successes, they still have many mountains to climb. When a two party system emerges, third parties are left crawling up the foothills. The constraints on third parties are as varied as the causes and reasons they exist. Several constraints become readily noticeable and some hide themselves under years of tradition.

Ballot Access Restrictions

“The Democrats and Republicans have constructed a maze of cumbersome regulations and procedures that make it difficult for minor parties and independent candidates to gain a spot on the general election ballot” (Rosenstone 19). Major parties appear automatically on the ballot, while third parties need to gain their space by circulating petitions and completing numerous

regulations. However, this was not always the case for third parties. Prior to 1890, political parties themselves printed ballots which listed only their candidates and distributed them at election day at the polls (Rosenstone 19). The voters would choose a ballot and then vote.

In effect this decidedly restricted voters choice, and later the United States adopted the Australian ballot system (Rosenstone 20). With this type system, all candidates appear on a ballot prepared by the state. Even though all can appear, states had to limit the number of parties allowed. Limitations, enacted by the Democrats and Republicans, soon surfaced which made getting placed on the ballot almost impossible.

Limited Resources

Small organizations tend to have limited funds, members, willing workers, and recognition. Upstart groups usually have less support from the mainstream, and therefore have limited abilities to affect elections. Political contributors are more likely to support a candidate that has a significant chance of being elected, than a small, unknown candidate who strongly supports their issue. They want to ensure their money will go to someone who will gain office and can eventually affect policies.

Campaign Funding

According to Rosenstone, even the most successful of the third party candidate's bids for the presidency are able to amass only a portion of the major party's money. Theodore Roosevelt, the best financed third party presidential candidate, spent only 60 percent of the average major party expenditures in 1912 (Rosenstone 27). Because of the small nature of the third parties, they experience trouble raising adequate funds. With limited money, they have trouble hiring political experts, gathering political expertise, and campaigning in general. Advertisements, signs, flyers and other political campaign paraphernalia does not come cheap. Money talks in the world of

politics; those with little of it rarely get heard.

Media Coverage

Money as well as media coverage is very rare for third parties to obtain. Media coverage propels a candidate into the limelight, giving recognition to their name, their party, their platform and their issues. “There is a huge disparity between the amount of coverage the media give minor parties and the attention they devote to Democrats and Republicans” (Rosenstone 33). Media executives convince themselves that the public cares only about campaigns and candidates that are likely to win. Therefore, they rarely cover third party bids for election (Gillespie 33).

Unknown Candidates

Resulting from a lack of campaign funds and media coverage, third party candidates are less well known. The track record of third party candidates obviously does not allow for much previous experience for the candidates (if they ran on the third party ticket for previous office). Most voters are looking directly at the previous leadership experiences and the candidates when they vote. Hence, the political obscurity of these candidates, their inability to publicize themselves effectively, and their neglect by the media mean that many voters simply do not have information on these candidates (Rosenstone 38).

Tradition and Socialization into the Two Party System

In our two party system, third parties often face problems with recognition and attracting membership. The two party system socializes Americans to believe that only a Democrat or a Republican can achieve success (Gillespie 29). Research shows that children usually join the party of their parents. Because so few third party members exist, few third party parents exist. Hence, the two party system continues generation after generation (30).

Major parties tend to gravitate their platforms toward the middle and to champion third party causes as their own. As a result, most Americans can strongly identify with one of the major parties (Gillespie 144). This allegiance to the party carries throughout their lives, making a third party vote seem like a stray from the norm. Also, it seems like a deviant act toward the system. Americans have strong loyalty to our democratic, federal, two party system (Gillespie 147).

IV. Methodology

Data Collection

Essentially, no one has completed a general study of gubernatorial elections where third party candidates were present and gained a substantial percent of the vote. Many people have examined congressional elections and presidential elections. This work parallels these studies, yet focuses on a gubernatorial level. This project is a part of a larger project by Professor Kenneth C. Martis to study the political party affiliation of the United States governors. This work constitutes only a small part of his project which remains a work in progress.

The research first examined all the governor's races from 1856 to 1996. Collecting the data was the project's most time consuming and largest facet. Many hours of searching and pouring through data in Congressional Quarterly's Guide to US Elections were conducted (Congressional Quarterly 1994). The Guide provides a comprehensive lists of all gubernatorial elections. Several problems arose with the data, such as missing data, missing party identifications and even conflicting party identifications. Missing candidate data was found by searching elections records and looking through various additional resources listed in Table One.

Table One: Resources Used in Determining Missing Candidate Data

<u>The Almanac of American Politics, 1998</u>	Michael Barone Grant Ujifusa	1997
<u>Congressional Quarterly's Guide to United States Elections</u>	Congressional Quarterly	1994
<u>Congressional Quarterly's Politics in America, 1998: The 105th Congress</u>	Phillip Duncan Christine Lawrence	1997
<u>American State Governors, 1776-1976</u>	Joseph & Jessamine Kallenbach	1977, 1981, 1982
<u>Taylor's Encyclopedia of Government Officials: Federal and State</u>	Taylor	1996

After the needed information was gathered, the data was compiled into concise tables. These tables present the data in a clear and simple-to-understand manner which also eases the readability of the information. This table follows the paper as Appendix A. It includes the parties and years in which third party candidates received more than five percent of the vote. Also included are an Appendices with a List of Abbreviations, a Table of Third Party Governors, Third Party Era Maps, and a List of Internet Sites.

Upon completion of the tables the data discloses definite eras and regions of third party political activity appeared. Certain states present themselves as more likely to vote for a third party candidate than others. To experiment with these theories, the election years were divided into specific eras, such as the Progressive, Greenback and Independent Eras. Third party activity was mapped to see if specific regions would appear within eras.

Relation to the Fields of Historical and Political Geography

This research on third party governors utilizes all aspects of historical and political geography. By determining the location of third party governors, spatial aspects of third party electability and regions likely to support third party candidates become clear. After examining the data, several definite patterns emerged. Political cultures obviously differ from region to region, reflecting the area's social, economic and religious background.

Party Identification

While conducting the research, several problems with party identification occurred. Sources would list differing abbreviations and parties for certain candidates. In some elections two or more Democrats or Republicans would be running against one another in the general election. These problems were solved one by one, searching through books for more information and searching election records. Most identifications were clarified using these books.

Table Two: Resources Used in Identifying Candidate Party Affiliations

<u>The Almanac of American Politics: 1998</u>	Michael Barone Grant Ujifusa	1997
<u>Congressional Quarterly's Guide to United States Elections</u>	Congressional Quarterly	1994
<u>Congressional Quarterly's Politics in America, 1998: The 105th Congress</u>	Phillip Duncan Christine Lawrence	1997
<u>American State Governors: 1776, 1976</u>	Joseph & Jessamine Kallenbach	1977, 1981, 1982
<u>Historical Atlas of Political Parties in the United States Congress: 1789-1989</u>	Kenneth C. Martis	1989
<u>American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections: 1979- 1987</u>	Marie Mullaney	1988
<u>History of United States Political Parties</u>	Arthur Schlesinger	1987
<u>Taylor's Encyclopedia of Government Officials: Federal and State</u>	Taylor	1996

Conventions Used in Research

Even though various records of candidates and elections exist, there are many discrepancies among them. Because of these discrepancies a number of conventions were used in the finished product of the research.

Electoral Margin Conventions

From the beginning decisions were made about how to execute the research. Should every candidate gaining even a small number of votes be analyzed? Eventually five percent was chosen as the crucial point in elections. Only those gaining more than five percent of the vote appear on the list in the Table of Candidates (Appendix A). Political scientists use the “five percent rule” as an indicator of candidate affect on elections. Most would agree that if a candidate gains five percent or more of the electoral vote, the candidate has been influential in the election. Taking publicity, focus and, ultimately, votes away from major party candidates affects elections in ways still being studied.

Party Identification Conventions

As stated earlier, party identification became a problem during the research process. Many times candidates are identified in the several reference sources with more than one party label. Also, at times two or more Democrats or Republicans are listed, or a candidate would list a major party and then a third party as their affiliation. In dealing with varying identifications, the party listed in the majority of sources was used. At times, additional information sources such as newspapers, books and journal articles were consulted if the major sources were in wide disagreement.

In instances where more than one major party candidate was listed, the candidate gaining the least amount of votes was considered a third party candidate. More than likely these candidates were splinter organizations of the major party and ran a separate candidate. For example, Henry W. Vail ran as an Independent Republican in the 1952 Vermont gubernatorial race against Lee E. Emerson (R) and Robert W. Larrow (D). Vail received 8.3% of the vote and Emerson won the election with 51.9% (Congressional Quarterly's Guide to US Elections 532). Therefore, Vail remains as the third party candidate.

There were also times in two-candidate elections when a major party candidate competed against another candidate which might have represented another major party in that state for that particular time period. For example, voters in the 1973 Virginia Governor's race had a choice between Mills E. Goodwin, Jr (R) and Henry Howell (I) (Congressional Quarterly's Guide to US Elections 532). In this instance, Howell was considered a third party.

Statehood and Civil War Conventions

Obviously if a state had not yet been accepted into the Union, they were not officially recognized and therefore did not have an official governor of a state in the United States. Non-states are designated by an asterisk (*) in the table. Also, states that succeeded during the Civil War are obviously not counted. They were indicated by a double asterisk (**). Only when the states are admitted or were readmitted are they considered in this study.

V. Findings

Eras

This research contributes to understanding the problem and question of third parties. The project provides specific insight into the aspects of third party gubernatorial successes in the United States. After collecting and examining the data several patterns emerged. Quite obviously

several times in our country's history called for increased representation of the traditionally non-political citizens. These times facilitated third party existence. Specific events such as agrarian hardships, labor movements, prohibitionist activity, and the Great Depression caused Americans to clamor for government actions which Democrats and Republicans seemed to ignore. Therefore, third parties rose to answer the public's call.

When examining the Table of Candidates (Appendix A) clusters of activity, or eras, appear. The eras were determined by peaks and valleys in third party activity. Appendix D1 shows the roller-coaster of third party activity. Definite peaks and valleys exist. Some periods in our history afforded third parties more success than others. These patterns as well as the frequency of party activity in Appendix A combine to present distinct eras. Both the Table of Candidates (Appendix A) and the Frequency of Third Party Candidates Per Year: 1866-1996 Graph (Appendix D1) facilitated the formation of eras.

Certain parties achieve success for several years, wane away, and another party comes to the forefront. The eras are given the name of the party which dominates the time period. Other parties may have existed, but the prevalent third party affiliation lent its name to the specific era. From the data, one gathers a sense of the periods of discontent in America. Obvious eras appear: The Greenback Era (1876-1884), The Populist Era (1891-1902), The Socialist and Progressive Era (1903-1918), and the Independent Era (1920-1996). For approximately the last eighty years, no third party dominates the political spectrum. Most effective third party activity on the gubernatorial level has dwindled away. Except for the occasional Independent, most third parties were overwhelmed by the Democrats and the Republicans.

Regions

By mapping third party activity, regional differences of support and election of third party governors become clear. States supporting third parties more or less frequently than others are easily seen. For the purpose of this research, maps were constructed using the third party activity eras as starting points. This broke the support into specific eras which makes it easier to observe regional aspects of support. Not only do the maps contain the specific party lending its name to the era, they contain all third parties gaining more than five percent of the popular vote.

The Greenback Era: 1876-1884 (Appendix E1)

During this era, there was notable third party activity. Considering that twelve states had not gained statehood and this era covers only a span of eight years, a significant amount of activity occurred. Two states had four third party candidates. A pocket of strong activity does appear in the Midwest. Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Texas all had two or more third party candidates. This region definitely saw more candidates gaining more of the vote. Maine had four third party candidates, and several states close to it also saw some activity.

Prior to the 1870s farmers had not formed independent political organizations. However, the increased reliance on rail transportation, coupled with railroads' exorbitant shipping rates prompted farmers to form organizations known as granges (Rosenstone 63). Soon, Western and Southern farmers became concerned with the lack of capital. They believed the government should again issue greenbacks (legal tender not backed by specie) as it did during the Civil War (Martis 44).

Eighteen hundred seventy six saw the formation of the first National Greenback Party (Rosenstone 65). Hardships continued and more support generated among farmers and laborers for the Greenbacks. Their platform in 1878 called for a shorter work week, government labor

bureaus, and restrictions on contract prison labor and immigration (Rosenstone 65). Adversities facing farmers in the Midwestern states led them to support third parties. As seen in Appendix E1, the majority of support comes from the center of the United States. The lone state, Maine, may have been experiencing labor difficulties which encouraged third party support. The Greenbacks essentially died out with the formation of the Anti-Monopoly Party in 1884. This new party espoused the main ideals of the Greenbacks. However, it too gave way to a new party and a new era of third party activity.

The Populist Era: 1891-1902 (Appendix E2)

With the western expansion of the United States, third party activity seemed to spread. In this era, some states had as many as six candidates gaining five percent or more of the vote. Again the Midwest tends to show more support for third parties. North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Colorado form a region of support. In the south, Texas and Arkansas each had five candidates, with Alabama and Georgia having four and six candidates respectively. Rhode Island stands out in New England by giving support to six third party candidates during this time. Comparing the Greenback and Populist Eras shows that the Midwest, South and random states in New England tend to support third parties more than other states.

It is not a coincidence that these are the same areas of support as the Greenback Era. The impact and the sentiments of the former Greenbacks carried over to influence the People's Party in the Midwest, the South and even in some New England states (Martis 46). In 1879 the national government extended gold backing to greenbacks. The former Greenback supporters then moved to support bimetallism. They also clamored for the free coinage of silver, tax reforms, changes in the tariff, government ownership of the railroads, and the regulation of banks, monopolies, and trusts (Martis 46).

Populists continued to rally support from farmers in the Midwest. Domestic over-cultivation, the ever troublesome railroads, and foreign agricultural import competition fueled the Populists' fire. This led to the formation of three separate interest groups within the movement: the Northern Alliance, the Southern Alliance and the National Colored Farmers Alliance. The Northern Alliance grew out of the drought suffered by Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa and Minnesota. The Southern Alliance formed first in Texas and spread to other areas of the south. The National Colored Farmers Alliance, with most African-Americans living in the south, began to join the Populist movement (Rosenstone 70).

The Socialist and Progressive Era: 1903-1918 (Appendix E3)

This era has several definite contrasts with the previous two eras. The prevalence of third party support seems to increase as time passes. In this era, there are four states having over six candidates who gained more than five percent of the popular vote. Minnesota and Wisconsin in the Upper Midwest, then Arkansas and Idaho. During this fifteen year period, the Western states seem more active in third party politics. Oregon, Washington, California, Montana, Idaho, Utah, and Colorado appear as a pocket of Western third party support. Ohio had four candidates, and Massachusetts, the lone New England state, had six candidates gaining more than five percent of the electoral vote.

The Socialist movement was still a continuation of the sentiments of the Greenbacks and the Populists before them (Martis 48). However, where these two former parties saw an increased role for government, the Socialists advocated collective ownership of the means of production and distribution as the solution for the nation's economic and agrarian hardships (Rosenstone 89). Reflecting the Populists, the Socialists were basically groups of regionalized interests coalesced together for a common purpose. Groups in the West pushed Populist ideals

which would benefit tenant farmers (Rosenstone 90). In the Far West, union miners and lumberjacks espoused radical notions.

Slowly the Socialists joined forces with Robert LaFollette's Progressive crusade and Theodore Roosevelt's Bull Moose Progressives. According to Martis, "The progressive movement had its roots in the 1880s and 1890s with the rapidly expanding 'new' white middle class" (49). Many Progressives were small businesspeople and professionals, such as lawyers, doctors, ministers, college professors and newspaper editors.

Progressives wanted to address the changing American economy by introducing numerous reforms on the political, social and economic arenas. Politically, their issues included: political primaries, ballot reform, initiatives, referendums, recall, direct election of senators, limits on campaign contributions and women's suffrage (Martis 49). Socially and economically, they espoused antitrust regulations, banking and monetary reforms, lower tariffs, an eight hour day, public ownership, conservation of natural resources and prohibition of child labor (Martis 49).

The Independent Era: 1920-1996 (Appendix E4)

Even though it was the longest period of third party gubernatorial activity, the Independent Era produced the fewest third party candidates as compared to other eras. Two states showed significant support for these candidates: Minnesota and Wisconsin. They form a small region in the Upper Midwest. Other than those two states, no real distinct regions appear. A drastic drop occurred in the number and frequency of successful third party candidates over the last 76 years. Many states had no candidates, or less than three. However, it becomes interesting to note that the states which do have some activity are the states which have had significant activity in the past. Minnesota and Wisconsin appear again and again as supporting third parties.

New England, the Midwest and Far West continue to throw their support to third parties.

These tendencies begin with the Greenback Era in 1876 and continue through time. New England stands out as a strong region of support as well as the Great Plains states (North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas and even Arkansas). The South had very little activity. A definite region of non-support forms in the middle of the country. Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri and Iowa all had no third party candidates gaining more than five percent of the popular vote. Also, Colorado and Wyoming form their own region of no third party support in the West.

Third Party Governors: 1876-1996 (Appendix E5)

As seen in Appendix E5, relatively few states actually had third party governors. Only fifteen states out of fifty over the past 120 years has a third party governor. These states are the ones which consistently support third parties. Stemming from past support, third parties actually gained office in these states. In comparison with the rest of the maps, regions in the Far West, Upper Midwest/Great Plains and in New England appear.

The Far West contains Washington, Oregon, California and Idaho. The Upper Midwest/Great Plains region encompasses North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Minnesota and Wisconsin. In New England, Maine has elected two third party governors. Rhode Island, West Virginia and Florida all exist as outliers. They do not fit concisely into a region of third party support, yet still elected a third party governor.

Third Party Gubernatorial Activity: 1876-1996 (Appendix E6)

This map shows the total state third party support for all years included in the research. A histogram was used to determine the color codes for the map. Table three shows the divisions.

Table Three: Divisions for the Appendix E6 Map

Tan	0-4
Light Brown	5-10
Mahogany	11-16
Brown	17-25

States which showed up throughout history as supporting third parties, now can be seen easily.

Two very small regions appear to have very strong support for third parties. Minnesota (23) and Wisconsin (25) supported the most third party candidates over the years. Texas (20) and Arkansas (21) also form a small region in the Southern Midwest. Massachusetts, the rebel New England state, supported 22 third party candidates and Idaho supported 18 candidates.

Regions of medium support also become apparent. The Midwest consistently supported third party candidates. North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Colorado each supported between ten and fifteen candidates each. California and Oregon form a small region along the West Coast. Showing the random support of the New England states, Maine, New York, Rhode Island and Connecticut all supported somewhere between ten and fifteen candidates. The underlying economic and agrarian hardships throughout this study still come into effect here. States showing consistent support for third parties were the ones constantly affected by the agricultural and labor movements.

Minnesota and Wisconsin throw their support to third parties consistently throughout the time period studied. Immigrants to the United States settled these areas very heavily. Between 1900 and World War I, over twelve million people had moved from their home country to the

United States (Rosenstone 90). Former Italians, Scandinavians, Hungarians, Germans, Poles, Lithuanians, and Russians joined and readily supported third parties. Most of their former countries supported socialist systems or multiple party systems. Therefore, the immigrants settling in Minnesota and Wisconsin were more inclined to vote for third party gubernatorial candidates.

VI. Conclusions

This research demonstrates that third party support does have certain patterns and characteristics. Certain third parties rise up and exist for definite periods of time. This becomes evident by perusing the Table of Candidates (Appendix A). Parties gain support during certain periods. Eventually they lose their support, or their cause loses its salience. However, it remains one huge cycle: prevalent parties appear, and then disappear, making way for other parties to emerge.

Parties emerge for various reasons. Agrarian hardships, industrial labor struggles, and economic downturns led the American people to become disenchanted with the present political parties. They turned to third parties to champion causes of the farmers, laborers, and small land owners and businesspeople. Often when a third party arises, it does so because of single issues. At times, citizens feel major parties have ignored certain issues. If a third party joins the fight for the issue, they may achieve successes at the polls.

The reasons for third party support may help explain the phenomenon of third party support regions. These regions obviously have major reasons for supporting third party candidates so readily. The Midwest, the Far West states, and select New England states have all consistently supported third party candidates. Obviously, the Midwest states existed mainly as agrarian communities and areas of prevalent immigrant settlements. Therefore, during the times

of hardship it is obvious they would support third parties. Following this agrarian tradition, certain states (Minnesota and Wisconsin) still today support third parties more often than other states. The gubernatorial elections in these areas reflect the values, traditions, economics and social nature of the citizens.

Governors play an important role in the function of our state government. Third parties play an important role in the two party system which most Americans accept without question. The entrance of a third party onto the political scene in America gives rise to those important questions. Third parties offer a forum for discussion of new and different ideas. They allow often disadvantaged groups to have a voice in the politics of their chosen party. In essence, third parties allow for expressions of discontent.

Bibliography

- Barone, Michael and Grant Ujifusa. The Almanac of American Politics, 1998. Washington, DC: National Journal, 1997.
- Black, Benjamin D. and Gordon S. Black. The Politics of American Discontent: How a New Party Can Make Democracy Work Again. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1994.
- Burnham, Walter Dean. Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics in Martin P. Wattenberg, The Decline of American Political Parties: 1952-1992. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994.
- Burnham, Walter Dean. The Current Crisis in American Politics. Oxford UP: New York, 1982.
- Congressional Quarterly's Guide to United States Elections. 3rd. ed. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1994.
- Creator's Rights Party. [Online] Available <http://www.christiangallery.com/creator.html> November 4, 1997.
- Duncan, Phillip and Christine Lawrence. Congressional Quarterly's Politics in America, 1998: The 105th Congress. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1997.
- Gillespie, J. David. Politics at the Periphery: Third Parties in Two-Party America. Columbus: U of SC P, 1993.
- Hesseltine, William Best. Rise and Fall of Third Parties. Washington, DC: Public Affairs P, 1948.
- Hesseltine, William Best. Third-Party Movements in the United States. Princeton: D Van Nostrand Company, 1962.
- Fiorna, Morris. Divided Government. 2nd. Ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1996.
- Fresia, Gerald John. There Comes a Time: A Challenge to the Two Party System. New York: Praeger, 1986.
- Kallenbach, Joseph and Jessamine. American State Governors, 1776-1976. Vol. I-III. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Oceana Publications, 1977, 1981, 1982.
- Kamieniecki, Sheldon. Party Identification, Political Behavior and the American Electorate. Westport: Greenwood P, 1985.

- Martis, Kenneth C. Historical Atlas of Political Parties in the United States Congress, 1789-1989. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1989.
- Mazmanian, Daniel A. Third Parties in Presidential Elections. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1974.
- Mullany, Marie Marmo. American Governors and Gubernatorial Elections: 1979-1987. Westport, CT: Meckler, 1988.
- Nash, Howard P. Jr. Third Parties in American Politics. Washington, DC: Public Affairs P, 1959.
- Pomper, Gerald. "Impacts on the Political System," in Samuel Kirkpatrick, ed., American Electoral Behavior: Change and Stability. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Ransone, Coleman B. Jr. The American Governorship. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1982.
- Ransone, Coleman B. Jr. The Office of the Governor in the United States. University, AL: U of Alabama P, 1956.
- Rosenthal, Alan. Governors and Legislators: Contending Powers. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1990.
- Rosentone, Steven J. Third Parties in America: Citizen Response to Major Party Failure. 2nd. ed. Princeton, NJ: 1996.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M, Jr. History of United States Political Parties. New York: Chelsea House, 1987.
- Taylor's Encyclopedia of Government Official: Federal and State. Election Supplement 1994-96. Dallas, TX: Political Research Inc.
- Tsongas, Paul. Journey of Purpose: Reflections on the Presidency, Multiculturalism, and Third Parties. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.
- US Taxpayers Party. [Online] Available <http://www.taxpayers.org> November 4, 1997.
- Wattenberg, Martin P. The Decline of American Political Parties: 1952-1992. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994.

Appendix A

Table of Third Party Candidates Receiving Five Percent or More of the Popular Vote 1856-1996

NOTES:

This table includes the years 1856-1996. The period between 1856 and 1866 was one of turmoil in many of the Southern states. Antebellum and post civil war sentiments still existed. Therefore, it becomes hard to determine actual third parties versus the apparent major parties in the south. This project only investigates gubernatorial races from 1866 in an effort to eliminate any confusion from the southern states.

Explanation of symbols:

* One asterisk means a state had not yet gained statehood.

** Two asterisks means a state had not yet rejoined the Union after the Civil War.

All abbreviations are located in Appendix B.

Appendix B

Abbreviations Used in Tables

A-AK R	Anti-Addicks Republican
ACP	A Connecticut Party
AG WHEEL	Agricultural Wheeler
A-LEC D	Anti-Lecompton Democrat
ALI	Alaskan Independent
ALNC	Alliance
ALNC D	Alliance Democrat
AM	American
AM&EMANC	American and Emancipation
AM LAB	American Labor
A-MONOP	Anti-Monopoly
AM&P	American and Prohibition
B&T R	Black and Tan Republican
C	Conservative
C PROG	Conservative and Progressive
CST U	Constitutional Union
D	Democrat
DISTRIB	Distributionist Candidate
DN	Democratic National
EP	Election Progressive
E TAX	Equal Tax
F ALNC	Farmers' Alliance
FILL AM	Fillmore American
F-LAB	Farmer Labor
FLA PP	Florida People's Party
FREM AM	Fremont American
FUS	Fusion
G	Greenback
G LAB	Greenback Labor
GREEN	Green Party
H LIC	High License
I	Independent
IA	Independent American
ID	Independent Democrat
I LEAGUE	Independence League
IL&NPR	Independence League and National Progressive
IP	Independent Party
IR	Independent Republican
IR&P	Independent Republican and Prohibition
IS	Illinois Solidarity
KEY	Keystone
L	Liberal
LAB	Labor
LAB REF	Labor Reform
LAB REF&P	Labor Reform and Prohibition
LAW ENF	Law Enforcement
LAW PRES	Law Preservation
LIB	Liberty
LIBERT	Libertarian

LOW TAX D	Low Tax Democrat
LRU	La Raza Unida
LU	Liberty Union
N	National Party
NDPA	National Democratic Party of Alabama
NG	National Greenback
NON PART	Non Partisan Candidate
NON PL	Non Partisan League
N PROG	National Progressive
N SILVER	National Silver
N UNION	National Union
OPP	Opposition
OPP D	Opposition Democrat
P	Prohibition
P&F ALNC	Prohibition and Farmers' Alliance
P&HG	Prohibition and Honest Government
POP	Populist
POP&SL D	Populist and Silver Democrat
PP	People's Party
PP I	People's Independent
PROG	Progressive
PROG-BMR	Progressive-Bull Moose-Roosevelt
PUB OWN	Public Ownership
R	Republican
READJ	Readjuster
SOC	Socialist
SOCIAL D	Social Democrat
SOC LAB	Socialist Labor
STAL D	Stalwart Democrat
TEMP	Temperance
TEMP REF	Temperance Reform
TCPT	Taxpayer's Party to Cut Taxes
UN D	Union Democrat
UNENROLLED	Unenrolled Candidate
UN LAB	Union Labor
W	Whig
WMP/L	Workingman's Party or League
WRITE IN	Write-in Candidate

Appendix F

INTERNET SITES

Communist Party--USA Page. [Online] Available <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/cp-usa> November 5, 1997.

Creator's Rights Party. [Online] Available <http://www.christiangallery.com/creator.html> November 4, 1997.

Democratic Socialists of America. [Online] Available <http://www.dsusa.org> November 4, 1997.

Libertarian Party. [Online] Available <http://www.lp.org/lp> November 4, 1997.

Libertarian Party. AllPolitics--New Jersey Exit Polls. [Online] Available email: sjones8@wvu.edu from raines@wvube1.be.wvu.edu, November 19, 1997.

National Socialist White People's Party. [Online] Available <http://www.nswpp.org> November 4, 1997.

Natural Law Party. [Online] Available <http://www.natural-law.org/nlpusa> November 4, 1997.

New Party. [Online] Available <http://www.newparty.org> November 4, 1997.

Patriot Party. [Online] Available <http://www.epix.net/~dschultz/patriot.html> November 4, 1997.

Peace and Freedom Party. [Online] Available <http://www.gate.crozio.com/~pfparty> November 4, 1997.

Reform Party. [Online] Available <http://www.reformparty.org> November 4, 1997.

Socialist Party. [Online] Available <http://www.socialist.org> November 4, 1997.

United We Stand America. [Online] Available <http://www.uwsa.org> November 4, 1997.

US Taxpayers Party. [Online] Available <http://www.ustaxpayers.org> November 4, 1997.

We The People. [Online] Available <http://ww.wtpp.org> November 4, 1997.

Workers Party. [Online] Available <http://www.universe.digex.net/~wp-usa> November 4, 1997.